UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,394	10/19/2000	Mansoor Abdulali Lakhdir	AUS9-2000-0398-US1	6086

7590 11/26/2003

Duke W Yee
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP
P O Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	4

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/692,394	LAKHDIR, MANSOOR ABDULALI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 January 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Detailed Action

Claims 1-31 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on paper 3 has been considered.

Formal Drawings

The formal drawings received on 1/17/01 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "simulating a browser" in claim 1, line 8. The examiner does not recognize how applicant's invention simulates a browser. Does applicant intend simulating a browser using an applet to create a socket-less connection?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Claims 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,935,249 by Stern et al. (Applicants IDS) (Stern).

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Claims 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al. (Applicants IDS) (Rogers).

Regarding claim 1, a method in a data processing system (Rogers: col. 5, lines 29-32) for communicating across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28) with a host (Rogers: col. 5, lines 32-34), the method comprising:

simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Rogers: col. 5, lines 14-20), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28); and

communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Rogers: col. 18, lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the simulating and communicating steps are performed by an applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 1, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the communications step is performed using hypertext transfer protocol data streams (Rogers: col. 5, lines 10, 11).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1, wherein the simulating step includes creating a universal resource locator connection with the host (Rogers: col. 19, lines 54-59).

Regarding claim 9, a method in an applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-51) on a client data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48, 49) for transferring data across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28) to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 55; IDS), the method comprising:

opening, by the applet, a universal resource locator connection to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59); and

transferring data across the firewall directly between the applet and the host data processing system using the universal resource locator connection (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 9, wherein the opening step is performed using a hypertext-transfer protocol message (Rogers: col. 10, lines 52; col. 3, lines 4-9).

Regarding claim 11, the method of claim 9, wherein the data is received by a servlet on the host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-53).

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 9, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-53).

Regarding claim 13, a data processing system (Stern: col. 3, lines 51-55) comprising:

a bus system (Stern: col. 4, line 24; internal bus);

a communications unit connected to the bus (Stern: col. 4, lines 24-30), wherein data is sent and received using the communications unit (Stern: col. 4, lines 31-36);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein a set of instructions are located in the memory (Stern: col. 3, lines 62-65); and

a processor unit connected to the bus system (Stern: col. 4, lines 21-24), wherein the processor unit executes the set of instructions to simulate a browser in the data processing system in which the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the fire wall and communicate with the host directly instead of using the browser (Stern: col. 3, lines 57-60).

Regarding claim 15, the data processing system of claim 13, wherein the processor unit includes a single processor (Stern: col. 4, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 17, the data processing system claim 13, wherein the communications unit is an Ethernet adapter (Stern: col. 5, line 16).

Regarding claim 18, a data processing system (Rogers: col. 5, lines 29-32) for communicating across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28)with a host (Rogers: col. 5, lines 32-34), the data processing system comprising:

simulating means for simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Rogers: col. 5, lines 14-20), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28); and

communicating means for communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Rogers: col. 18, lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 19, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the simulating and communicating means are located in an applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 20, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 21, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the communication means uses hypertext transfer protocol data streams (Rogers: col. 5, lines 10, 11).

Regarding claim 22, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the simulating step includes creating an universal resource locator connection with the host (Rogers: col. 19, lines 54-59).

Regarding claim 26, a data processing system in an applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-51) on a client data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48, 49) for transferring data across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28) to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 55; IDS), the data processing system comprising:

opening means for opening, by the applet, a universal resource locator connection to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59); and

transferring means for transferring data across the firewall directly between the applet and the host data processing system using the universal resource locator connection (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59).

Regarding claim 27, the data processing system of claim 26, wherein the opening step is performed using a hypertext transfer protocol message (Rogers: col. 10, lines 52; col. 3, lines 4-9).

Regarding claim 28, the data processing system of claim 26, wherein the data is received by a servlet on the host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-53).

Regarding claim 29, the data processing system of claim 26, wherein the applet is a Java applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-53).

Regarding claim 30, a computer program product (Rogers: col. 6, lines 27-30) in a computer readable medium (Rogers: col. 10, lines 8-15) for use in a data processing system (Rogers: col. 5, lines 29-32) for communicating across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28) with a host (Rogers: col. 5, lines 32-34), the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for simulating a browser in the data processing system to form a simulation (Rogers: col. 5, lines 14-2), wherein the browser being simulated is able to communicate through the firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28); and

second instructions for communicating with the host directly using the simulation instead of using the browser (Rogers: col. 18, lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 31, a computer program product (Rogers: col. 6, lines 27-30) in a computer readable medium (Rogers: col. 10, lines 8-15) for use in an applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-52) on a client data processing system (Rogers: col. 5, lines 29-32) for transferring data across a firewall (Rogers: col. 9, lines 24-28) to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 5, lines 32-34), the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for opening, by the applet (Rogers: col. 10, lines 48-52), a universal resource locator connection to a host data processing system (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59); and

second instructions for transferring data across the firewall directly between the applet and the host data processing system using the universal resource locator connection (Rogers: col. 10, lines 51-59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,793,966 by Amstein et al ("Amstein").

Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,935,249 by Stern et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,380 by LaBerge et al ("LaBerge").

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,441 by Rogers et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,793,966 by Amstein et al ("Amstein").

Regarding claim 6,

The Rogers reference teaches a system of data processing and communicating data across a network.

The Rogers reference does not explicitly state the use of a MIME content header in its communication.

The Amstein reference teaches (the method of claim 1), wherein the step of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a multipurpose Internet mail extension content-type header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Amstein: col. 5, lines 52-60).

The Amstein reference further teaches this system causes a server to perform one of a collection of operations, which support the creation, and maintenance of an online service overcoming the problem of requiring additional installation for post and get methods (Amstein: col. 10, lines 25-30; col. 9, line 47, col. 9, line 64)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of data processing and communicating data across a network as taught by Rogers while employing a MIME content header as taught by Amstein to perform one of a collection of operations, which support the creation, and maintenance of an online service

overcoming the problem of requiring additional installation for post and get methods (Amstein: col. 10, lines 25-30; col. 9, line 47, col. 9, line 64)

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Rogers et al and Amstein et al.

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 6, wherein the message is used to open a universal resource locator connection to a program on the server (Amstein: col. 5, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1, wherein the step of communicating includes sending a message with a universal resource locator identifying a program to receive the data (Amstein: col. 6, lines 14-23).

Regarding claim 14.

The Stern reference teaches a system of data processing in a network environment.

The Stern reference does not explicitly state the use of primary and secondary buses.

The LaBerge reference teaches a bus system includes a primary bus and a secondary bus (LaBerge: col. 2, lines 66 - col. 3, 3).

The LaBerge reference further teaches this bus system overcomes the problems of a lower clock rate and thus forcing a slower and relatively more inefficient computer system, having decreased system throughput (LaBerge: col. 1, lines 23-29)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of data processing as taught by Stern while employing multiple bus lines as taught by LaBerge to overcome the problems of a lower clock rate and thus forcing a slower and relatively more inefficient computer system, having decreased system throughput (LaBerge: col. 1, lines 23-29)

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Stern et al and LaBerge.

Regarding claim 16, the data processing system of claim 13, wherein the processor unit includes a plurality of processors (LaBerge: col. 2, lines 19-29).

Regarding claim 23,

The Rogers reference teaches a system of data processing and communicating data across a network.

The Rogers reference does not explicitly state the use of a MIME content header in its communication.

The Amstein reference teaches (the method of claim 18), the means of communicating with the host includes sending a message in which a multipurpose internet mail extension content-type header field is set to specify the type of data in the body of the message (Amstein: col. 5, lines 52-60).

The Amstein reference further teaches this system causes a server to perform one of a collection of operations, which support the creation, and maintenance of an online service overcoming the problem of requiring additional installation for post and get methods (Amstein: col. 10, lines 25-30; col. 9, line 47, col. 9, line 64)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of data processing and communicating data across a network as taught by Rogers while employing a MIME content header as taught by Amstein to perform one of a collection of operations, which support the creation, and maintenance of an online service overcoming the problem of requiring additional installation for post and get methods (Amstein: col. 10, lines 25-30; col. 9, line 47, col. 9, line 64)

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Rogers et al and Amstein et al.

Regarding claim 24, the data processing system of claim 23, wherein the message is used to open a universal resource locator connection to a program on the server (Amstein: col. 5, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 25, the data processing system of claim 18, wherein the means of communicating includes sending a message with a universal resource locator identifying a program to receive the data (Amstein: col. 6, lines 14-23)

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,742,769 issued to Lee et al.

U. S. Patent No. 5,732,219 issued to Blumer et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb BRB
Nov. 1, 2003

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER